

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 7, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 4-8, and 16 are hereby amended. No claims are canceled or added. Accordingly, claims 1-8, and 16 are currently pending for prosecution on the merits, with claims 9-15 withdrawn from prosecution. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**The Office has objected to claim 1 for the use of the word “operation.”** Office Action at p. 2. As suggested by the office the word, “operation,” has been changed to -- operations--. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

**The Office has rejected claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.** Office Action at p. 3. Regarding claims 8 and 16, the claims have amended to more clearly read that the information may contain “at least” one of the three types of information recited. Regarding claims 4, 5, and 7, the claims have been amended to remove any potential indefiniteness that the Office has pointed to. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph of claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 16 be withdrawn.

**The Office has rejected claims 1-3, and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2001/0049846 to Guzzi et al. (hereinafter *Guzzi*).** Office action at p. 3.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and asserts that *Guzzi* fails to disclose a washing system comprising, at least, “a reader for receiving a signal from the information tag on the laundry, the signal containing the laundry information, to obtain the laundry kind information stored in the information tag; and a home server in communication with the control unit of the laundry device so as to supply various control signals, for receiving information obtained by the reader, retrieving washing information corresponding to the received laundry information, setting

a washing control algorithm based on the retrieved information, and performing remote control of the laundry device,” as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office asserts that *Guzzi*’s director 25 satisfies the claimed limitation of a home server, however, *Guzzi*’s director 25 fails to independently change the washing information for the laundry device and then operate the laundry device accordingly. Office Action at p. 4. In fact, director 25 only provides washing information, or “optimized laundry conditions,” to the washing machine, but does not actually implement them. *Guzzi* at ¶ [0071]. *Guzzi*’s device presents the “optimized laundry conditions” to a user and allows the user to “accept or modify the optimized laundry conditions,” such that the user actually performs control and initiation of the laundry device via a user interface 28. *Id.*

Therefore, *Guzzi* wholly fails to anticipate, “retrieving washing information corresponding to the received laundry information, setting a washing control algorithm based on the retrieved information, and performing remote control of the laundry device,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Guzzi*. Claims 2, 3, and 5-7, which are dependent on claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants, therefore request withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of claims 1-3 and 5-7.

**The Office has rejected claims 4, 8, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guzzi*.** Office action at p. 5.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and, as discussed above, asserts that *Guzzi* fails to disclose a washing system comprising, at least, “a reader for receiving a signal from the information tag on the laundry, the signal containing the laundry information, to obtain the laundry kind information stored in the information tag; and a home server in communication with the control unit of the laundry device so as to supply various control signals, for receiving information obtained by the reader, retrieving washing information corresponding to the received laundry information, setting a washing control algorithm based on the retrieved information, and performing remote control of the laundry device,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1, as discussed above, is patentably distinguishable over *Guzzi*. Claims 4, 8, and 16, which are dependent on claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants, therefore request withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(1) of claims 4, 8, and 16.


### CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  Reg # 40,106  
**Michael J. Angert**  
Registration No.: 46,522  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant